



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

as they were that "horrid war" is about to burst upon them out of the East. The people of the nation as a whole have become quite scare-proof in that direction, and are now fully convinced that war with Japan is impossible, as impossible as anything earthly can well be.

The relations between Great Britain and Russia in Persia and elsewhere are peaceable and apparently cordial. The North Sea and Baltic agreements among the powers specially interested in those territories have allayed the mutterings and anxieties previously existing, and that whole region seems now consecrated to perpetual peace.

The remarkable bloodless revolution in Turkey, which has put the Young Turkey Party in possession of all departments of the government, has changed the entire aspect of the Eastern question, and for the time being the Macedonian discussions of the powers have ceased. If the revolution accomplishes its purposes, and constitutional government is permanently established, it looks as if the whole Turkish question, which has been the bane of Europe, would disappear entirely from international politics.

There is nothing new to say of the relations of the Far East to the Western powers. The situation left by the Russo-Japanese war remains unchanged. Feelings between Japan and Russia are more friendly than might have been expected after such a frightful conflict. Their relations, since the conclusion of the recent treaty between them, are such as probably to prevent any serious misunderstanding for many years to come,—we had almost said, "in the future." Chinese distrust of the Western powers has scarcely been weakened, though in several quarters there is evidently a growing tendency to treat China with greater justice. Because of her distrust she is adding continually to her army some twenty-five thousand men annually, and having them trained under European officers.

The most disturbed point in the international situation is, we are sorry to say, as it has been for some time, in the relations between England and Germany. Misrepresentation and bitterness of feeling still prevail on both sides of the North Sea, and the mischief-making journals of both countries continue their despicable work. But that any serious calamity will be the outcome is not for a moment to be believed. More persons than ever before are working in both countries steadily and intelligently for an *entente cordiale* between the two nations. Among these are many of the leading statesmen of both. Mutual visits of groups of business men, clergymen, municipal officials, etc., have already begun to undermine the misunderstandings and remove the excuses for bad blood. At the moment there is clearly an improvement in the situation, though this change for the better is greatly retarded by the big-navy rivalry between London and Berlin. So long as this riv-

alry continues Anglo-German relations will be subject to frequent recurrences of alarm and rumors of conflict.

The chief encouragement in the general international situation is that the factors which make for settled good feeling and concord have come to have a *staying* power never before known. The hasty survey made above shows this clearly. Occurrences which once almost instantaneously flung war hot into the international arena are to-day quickly overpowered by patient, intelligent, rightminded diplomacy, supported by quick movements of the better sort of public opinion. Where the elements of war abound, the elements of peace much more abound. That is a great gain, and gives large promise for the future.

What the One Man in Berlin Might Do.

On the eve of the opening of the Interparliamentary Conference at Berlin last month, Andrew Carnegie sent a letter to Hon. Richard Bartholdt, president of the United States Group of the Interparliamentary Union, in which he said:

"I cannot escape the conclusion that the abolition of war among civilized nations as a mode of settling international disputes is very easily accomplished. There will be one man in Berlin while your congress is in session who has only to speak the word. The emperor of Germany has it in his power to abolish war among civilized nations. All he has to do is to ask Great Britain, France and the United States to unite with him in declaring that, since the world has contracted to a 'neighborhood' and is in constant and instantaneous communication one part with another, the interchange of products between them amounting to thousands of millions a year, the time has passed when any one civilized nation can be permitted to break that peace in which all are so deeply interested. International disputes must be settled by arbitration. Neither of the three countries named could afford to reject this invitation, and the emperor would have performed a service to the world unequalled by any human being that ever lived. Whether his majesty is to fail in this great mission and pass into history as one of a long line of rulers not men of achievements, but only of title, or to awake some morning to his duty and perform his mission, we cannot tell, but I shall hope that the angel of the Lord will appear unto him."

This is a restatement of the plan which has several times been suggested by Mr. Carnegie, notably in his St. Andrews University Rectorial address, to ensure the settled peace of the world. His thought is that the four great powers mentioned should enter into an agreement never to go to war with each other, and never to allow any other two powers to fight each other.

It is possible that a league of peace of this kind might work, if the *enormous* difficulty of starting it could be gotten out of the way, and at the same time admission of the other forty powers to it were made perfectly free.

No such league based on force could possibly succeed if it were made exclusive, and the rest of the powers were forced to feel that they were to be under the compulsion of the mailed fist of the four as to their conduct in reference to one another. History has made perfectly clear what the result of such a coalition would be.

But Mr. Carnegie is probably entirely right in believing that Emperor William holds the key, or at least one of the keys, to the conditions which would lead to the abolition of war among the civilized nations. Germany and Great Britain, more than any other or all others of the powers, stood in the way at The Hague last year of the adoption of certain measures which would have made war extremely improbable, if not impossible, in the future. Germany refused to have anything to do with limitation of armaments and declined to accept the proposition for a general treaty of obligatory arbitration, even of limited scope, to both of which Great Britain was favorable. Great Britain, in her turn, rejected the proposal for an agreement to make unoffending private property at sea exempt from capture in time of war, a proposal favored by the Kaiser's government. These reserves of the two great powers on opposite sides of the North Sea put a big stick in the wheels of the Hague Conference which blocked the whole machinery. Now, if the German government, led by the Kaiser, would say to Great Britain, "we will accept a general treaty of obligatory arbitration and the principle of limitation of armaments, and will be ready sincerely to coöperate with you and other powers in carrying these principles into operation, provided the British government will agree to the immunity of private property at sea," the greatest political obstacle to the further progress of the cause of world peace would be out of the way. Something like this would have to take place in any event between Germany and England, even if the Kaiser should attempt to create a league of compulsory peace, as suggested by Mr. Carnegie. If this, however, were done, there would be absolutely no demand for such a league of force, for a world league of a purely pacific nature composed of all the nations would be the natural and almost immediate result. It is along this line that the Kaiser's supreme opportunity lies.

Are Armaments Only Mere Symptoms?

Hon. Richard Bartholdt, president of the United States Group of the Interparliamentary Union, in an instructive and interesting article on the history and work of the Union, in the *Christian Endeavor World* for September 17, uses the following language:

"And right here it might be stated that the union of lawmakers of which I write is neither opposed to adequate armament, nor does it advocate disarmament as

an independent proposition. Its members have learned that no headway whatever can be made along these lines. Surely, like all well-meaning men and women, they would like to see the world disarm in order that the billions now spent for preparations for war might be expended for the advancement of education, science and art, and for the improvement of rivers and roads (and if this could be done, what a paradise the world would be!), but they now realize the futility of all efforts in that direction, as this has been so amply demonstrated by the two peace conferences at The Hague.

"Armaments are merely symptoms of a cause, and the cause is the absence of international agreements to keep the peace. It will be easier to remove the cause first by securing such agreements, and, when these have been once secured, the symptom is bound to disappear along with the cause."

Mr. Bartholdt is usually so clear and correct in his statements and his reasoning that one hesitates to point out what seem to be errors in what he says. But this statement of his is open to two or three strictures. His language seems to charge that other "well-meaning men and women," outside of the Interparliamentary Union, are advocating disarmament as an independent proposition. This is not the fact, so far as we know. The most extreme advocates of the abolition of armaments have always insisted, as the fundamental feature of their program, that the nations should enter into solemn and permanent "agreements to keep the peace," and thus remove the excuse for armaments, as well as armaments themselves. That has been the historic method of the pacifists, and it is their method at the present time. Their urgent plea, not for disarmament at first, but for limitation, for arrest of the everlasting rivalry in the development of armaments, is backed not only by the conviction of the wickedness and folly of the burdensome system of competitive arming, but also by the fact that enough has already been done through the Hague Conferences and otherwise in establishing a recognized and adequate substitute for war to justify, or rather to demand, an immediate suspension of the current military and naval rivalry. This, if we remember rightly his speech in Congress last spring against the building of four new battleships, is Mr. Bartholdt's own position. It is likewise the position of the Interparliamentary Union, as expressed by its action at London two years ago.

Again, Mr. Bartholdt hardly states the case accurately when he says that the futility of efforts for disarmament has been amply demonstrated by the two peace conferences at The Hague. The truth is that the subject of disarmament was not before the Conference at all. It was the much more modest proposition of an arrest of the growth of armaments with which that body was last year asked by Great Britain to deal; and the efforts made in this direction, while without immediate practical